UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/501,685	04/04/2005	Tadayoshi Shiraishi		4435
	7590 07/17/200 BOVE LODGE & HUT	EXAMINER		
1875 EYE STR SUITE 1100	EET, N.W.	O HERN, BRENT T		
WASHINGTON	N, DC 20006	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1794	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/17/2009	PAPER

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/501,685	SHIRAISHI ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	Brent T. O'Hern	1794					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 08 July 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
<ol> <li>The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:</li> </ol>	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit al (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	which places the r (3) a Request				
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ar no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection	on.				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply original controls.	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee be action; or (2) as				
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in completing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the					
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b  (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor  (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below  (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or  (d) They present additional claims without canceling a content of the second con	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w); er form for appeal by materially rec	TE below);					
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).  4.   The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12  5.   Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).  7.   For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [	all 35 USC 112 rejections.  owable if submitted in a separate, t  ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☑ will	imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the				
how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 15-21 and 23. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 1-7 and 9-14.  AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>							
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	ıl and/or appellant fail	s to provide a				
10.  ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatior REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.				
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u></li> </ol>		condition for allowan	ce because:				
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). ( 13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)						
/BTO/ Brent T. O'Hern Examiner, Art Unit: 1794	/Elizabeth M. Cole/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 1794					
LAGITHICI, AT UTIL. 1734							

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

All 35 USC 112 rejections have been withdrawn due to Applicant's amendments.

In response to Applicant's arguments (See p. 7, para. 3 to p. 9, para. 3 of Applicant's Paper filed 7/8/2009.) that there is not any motivation to add ubiquinone under heating at a temperature of not lower 48 C because it would be contrary to the suggestion of Udel ('942), as Udel ('942) relates to production of soft gel capsules which are distinct from foods and separation or localization is not a problem of concern with soft gels, it is noted that independent claim 15 is not directed to just food but rather a "supplementation food" which can be include soft gels.

In response to Applicant's arguments (See p. 8, para. 3 of Applicant's Paper filed 7/8/2009.) that there is not any reason to retain ubiquinone in a dissolved state because Udel ('942) teaches using wax as a suspension agent, it is noted that once the mixture cools the wax helps to provide uniformity due to its thickening properties upon cooling.

In response to Applicant's arguments regarding claim 16 (See p. 8, para. 5 to p. 9, para. 1 of Applicant's Paper filed 7/8/2009.) that the melting point of the MCT is not 20 C or higher because the MCT are obtained from fractionation of coconut oil, it is noted that coconut oil contains fat and oil fractions and fractionation is a known method of separating fats/oils by cooling into fractions of fats/oil having different melting points. Thus, it is not clear why Applicant believes the oils do not have a melting point not lower than 20 C as the fractions have different melting points.

In response to Applicant's arguments (See p. 8, para. 6 to p. 9, para. 3 of Applicant's Paper filed 7/8/2009.) that because hydrogenated cottonseed oil has a melting point of 38 C and the MCT fraction of the MCT is not hydrogenated the melting points of the MCT fraction do not change, it if firstly noted that it is not clear what point Applicant is trying to make since MCT can include fatty acid chains that are either saturated or unsaturated while having the same length and if one desired to have a uniform MCT they will hydrogenate all of the MCT to provide a composition with little to no unsaturated MCT if desired. Furthermore, un-fractionated or fractionated coconut oil can be hydrogenated with the hydrogenation being of any degree from slightly to fully with a spectrum of melting points in between.

In response to Applicant's arguments (See p. 9, para. 6 to p. 10, para. 6 of Applicant's Paper filed 7/8/2009.) that Selzer ('307) teaches away from heating ubiquinone because ubiquinone is not very stable and deteriorates at temperatures above 115 F, it is noted that this does not mean ubiquinone can not be subjected to said temperature but rather precautions should be taken when handling. The same is true for oils and many other materials. Oils are also not very stable and deteriorate at said temperatures, however, it is still routine to process oils at said temperatures while taking precautions such as operating under vacuums.

In response to Applicant's arguments (See p. 10, para. 2 of Applicant's Paper filed 7/8/2009.) that since Selzer ('307) is used for supplements it does not belong to ordinary foods one and would not look to Selzer ('307) for solving separation or localization problems, it is noted that Applicant's claims do not just relate to food but "ubiquinone supplementation". Thus, Applicants arguments are not persuasive as Selzer ('307) and Applicant's materials are both used for supplements..

/BTO/ Brent T. O'Hern Examiner, Art Unit: 1794